



PB98-140692

**METALLURGICAL EVALUATION OF
A DOT-E6498-2216 CYLINDER**
FaAA Project No.: DC17916.000

Prepared for:

Mark Toughiry
DHM-22, RSPA
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street S.W.
Washington D.C. 20590

Prepared by:

Timothy R. Smith, Ph.D., P.E.
Failure Analysis Associates, Inc.
310 Montgomery Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

January 1997



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE January, 1997		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final Report	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Metallurgical Evaluation of a DOT-E 6498-2216 Cylinder				5. FUNDING NUMBERS DTRS56-97-P-70155	
6. AUTHOR(S) Timothy R. Smith, Ph.D., P.E.					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Failure Analysis Associates, Inc. 310 Montgomery Street Alexandria, VA 22314				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER FaAA-DC-FR-97-01-01	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Special Programs Administration Office of Hazardous Materials Technology, DHM-20 400 Seventh Street, SW Washington, DC 20590				10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER OHMS-97-TC-001	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Related reports dated July 2, 1996 and September, 1997 document other failures of DOT-3AL cylinders.					
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA. Availability of related reports can be determined by contacting the sponsoring agency at the address above.				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This report documents a metallurgical examination of a failed aluminum cylinder authorized for the transportation in commerce of specified liquefied and nonliquefied compressed gases. The DOT-3AL cylinder, manufactured under exemption DOT-E 6498, was in breathing air service for fire-fighting use. The evaluation included photodocumentation and non-destructive examinations, chemical and mechanical property determination, metallographic sectioning, and fractography. The origin of the fracture was determined to be consistent with sustained load cracking (SLC) reported in the literature for similar aluminum alloys.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS DOT-3AL cylinder 6351 alloy sustained load cracking (SLC)				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 50	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified				18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	
19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified				20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Visual Examination	1
3.0	Quantitative Chemical Analysis	2
4.0	Mechanical Testing	3
5.0	Sectioning and Metallography	4
6.0	Fractography	5
7.0	Discussion	7
8.0	Summary and Conclusions	8
9.0	References	9

APPENDIX A: Recommended Scope of Work.

APPENDIX B: Detailed photodocumentation of cylinder.



LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
Figure 1.	Remains of the cylinder, as received.	10
Figure 2.	Mating fracture surfaces (fragments 2A-1 and 2A-2) at the inlet hole.	11
Figure 3.	Fragment 2A-1 fracture surface, neck region.	12
Figure 4.	Cylinder fragment 2A-1.	13
Figure 5.	Sectioning of fragments 2A-2 and 2A-4.	14
Figure 6.	Wafers FS and MET from Figure 5.	15
Figure 7.	Sectioning of fragment 2A-1 in the neck region.	16
Figure 8.	Metallographic sections of 2A-1A2B containing SC2.	17
Figure 9.	Close-up of crack "A" from Figure 8.	18
Figure 10.	A crack tip from Figure 8.	19
Figure 11.	Precipitates near a crack tip.	20
Figure 12.	Fractography of fracture surface (planar-region) from fragment 2A-2.	21
Figure 13.	EDS Spectra captured from the flat-faced fracture surface.	22
Figure 14.	Fractography of fracture surfaces of crack SC2 forced open in the laboratory.	23
Figure 15.	EDS Spectra from fracture surface shown in Figure 12.	24
Figure 16.	SEM fractographs of a tensile specimen.	25



1.0 Introduction

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) contracted with Failure Analysis Associates, Inc. (FaAA) to perform a metallurgical examination of the remains of a failed aluminum cylinder. The cylinder, a DOT-E6498-2216 type¹ with serial number T127279 manufactured by Luxfer USA, was incorporated into a Scott Air Pak for fire-fighting use.

The scope of this investigation was to perform a detailed evaluation of the cylinder remains, including photodocumentation and non-destructive examinations, chemical and mechanical property determination, metallographic sectioning, and fractography. The detailed workscope for this evaluation is provided in Appendix A. This report presents the findings of this evaluation.

2.0 Visual Examination

A visual examination of the cylinder remains was performed. The remains are shown in Figure 1, in the as-received condition. The cylinder broke apart into four large pieces and at least two small fragments. At the time of FaAA's inspection, a circular sample of material had been cut from one piece and contained burn markings, presumably from tests by optical emission spectroscopy to determine its bulk chemistry. In addition, some aluminum chips, presumably from drilled holes at unknown location(s), were also included in the remains.

Stampings on the neck of the cylinder indicated that the first hydrostatic test on it was performed in 11/77. This is taken as its date of manufacture. Inspection stampings indicated that the cylinder had been pressure re-tested in 1982, 1988, and 1993. Further markings of "SCOTT" indicate the original equipment manufacturer of the air pak (not required by DOT); however, the aluminum cylinder was manufactured by Luxfer USA, per the E6498 exemption. A complete photodocumentation of the pieces was undertaken and is presented in Appendix B.

The fracture surfaces of the cylinder were inclined (i.e., non-radial with respect to the cylinder axis) shear-type, except in the neck region where the fracture surfaces were flat and radial with respect to the axis of the cylinder. The main fracture surface ran through essentially a full diameter of the inlet hole in the neck region. Figure 2 shows the matching halves of the fracture surface from the neck region (fragments 2A-1 and 2A-2). The larger of the two pieces (2A-1) had foreign contamination on the fracture surface on both sides of the inlet hole. This contamination appeared to be paint and either concrete dust or plaster. This piece also showed impact damage to the fracture surface at the inlet

¹ DOT E6498 is an exemption, dated 7/76, to the provisions of DOT's then-applicable Hazardous Materials Regulations granted to Luxfer, USA Ltd. to manufacture, mark and sell cylinders for the use in transportation in commerce of certain liquefied and nonliquefied compressed gases. This exemption satisfies the DOT-3A1 section of 49 CFR-178.45.



hole, presumably a result of the pressurized cylinder rupture. Other pieces also showed impact damage at certain locations, all appearing to be from the rupture event.

Figure 3 shows two views of the fracture surface of fragment 2A-1 from the neck region. The inside wall of the cylinder in this region shows multiple folds (or cusps) from the original manufacturing process. The fracture surface on both sides of the inlet hole appears to pass through deep folds of this type. On fragment 2A-1, there were at least two large cracks, labeled SC1 and SC2 on Figure 3, originating from these folds.

3.0 Quantitative Chemical Analysis

A portion of the cylinder was removed and tested by optical emission spectrometry to determine the chemical composition. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 1 and indicate that the cylinder conforms to the Aluminum Association (AA) 6351 alloy specification and satisfies the DOT-E6498 specification for aluminum alloy chemistry.

Table 1: Chemistry of the Cylinder, Neck Region

Element	Test Result	Composition (wt.%)	
		AA6351 Specification (low)	AA6351 Specification (high)
Mg	0.62	0.40	0.80
Si	0.96	0.70	1.30
Ti	0.03	0.00	0.20
Mn	0.60	0.40	0.80
Fe	0.22	0.00	0.50
Cu	0.01	0.00	0.10
Zn	0.01	0.00	0.20
OE	<0.05	0.00	0.05
OT	<0.15	0.00	0.15
Al	balance	balance	balance

Chemical composition determined by optical emission spectrometry in accordance with the ASTM-E1019-94 standard. "OE" denotes "other elements", "OT" denotes the total of all "other elements" not listed in the table.

Samples of chips, taken using an electric drill from the neck, the sidewall, and the bottom of the cylinder, were dissolved in solution and analyzed by atomic absorption spectrometry to determine their chemical composition. The results are shown in Table 2.



Table 2: Chemistry of the Cylinder

Element	Composition (wt.%)				
	Test Result Neck	Test Result Side wall	Test Result Bottom	49 CFR-178.46-5 Specification (low)	49 CFR-178.46-5 Specification (high)
Mg	0.73	0.68	0.65	0.40	0.80
Si	0.90	0.90	1.00	0.70	1.30
Ti	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.20
Mn	0.60	0.62	0.62	0.40	0.80
Fe	0.23	0.21	0.14	0.00	0.50
Cu	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.10
Zn	<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	0.00	0.20
Bi	<0.0050	<0.0050	<0.0050	0.00	0.01
Pb	<0.0040	<0.0040	<0.0050	0.00	0.01
Al	balance	Balance	balance	balance	balance

Chemical composition determined by atomic absorption spectrometry in accordance with the ASTM-E663 and ASTM-D3335 standards.

These results show compliance with both the DOT exemption E6498 and the current DOT federal regulation 49 CFR 178.46-5, with no significant variations based on the sample location from within the cylinder. Note that the Pb levels found were below the detection threshold of 40 weight-ppm (5.2 atomic-ppm²). In addition, the Bi levels were below 50 weight-ppm (6.5 atomic-ppm).

4.0 Mechanical Testing

4.1 Tensile Testing

Standard size ASTM 370 tensile test coupons from the cylinder wall, aligned along the cylinder axis, were tested at room temperature. Fragment 2A-1 was sectioned, Figure 4(a), and component 2A-1C was used for tensile test coupons, as it contained material minimally deformed by the cylinder rupture. Three full-thickness coupons were chosen and Figure 4(b) shows them in the post-tested configuration. The test data are shown in Table 3.

The average values found are above the current 49 CFR 178.46-5 minimum specification and exceed the elongation requirement of E6498. They compare well with values of 42.8 ksi yield strength, 49.3 ksi ultimate strength and 13% elongation (2 inch gauge length), published for 6351 in T6 temper [1]. DOT E6498 requires that the material be AA6351-T6.

² calculated using the equation: atomic-ppm (Pb) = weight-ppm (Pb)*GMW(Al)/GMW(Pb); where GMW is the gram molecular weight of the element in parenthesis. The same equation was used for the Bismuth level with Bi replacing Pb.



Table 3: Mechanical Properties

Test	Yield (ksi)	UTS (ksi)	Elongation (%)	49 CFR 178.46-5 Yield (min.) (ksi)	49 CFR 178.46-5 UTS (min.) (ksi)	Elongation (%)
2A-1C#1	46.5	51.5	19.0	37.0	42.0	14
2A-1C#2	46.9	50.5	16.0	37.0	42.0	14
2A-1C#3	47.0	50.5	15.0	37.0	42.0	14
Average	46.8	50.8	16.7	37.0	42.0	

Notes:

1. Tests were performed in accordance with the ASTM A370-77 Standard; gauge length was 2 inches.
2. Yield denotes the yield strength (0.2% offset), UTS denotes ultimate tensile strength.
3. Elongation values from the flat coupons tested here differ from the 49 CFR 178.46-5 values based on cylindrical specimens. E6498 requires a minimum elongation of 14% in either flat or cylindrical specimens.

4.2 Hardness Testing

Rockwell hardness measurements were made on a slice removed from the tank sidewall area of fragment 2A-2B (see Figure 5). A total of ten measurements was taken; the results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Hardness Measurements

Component	Indent No.	Hardness (Rockwell B)	Average Hardness (Rockwell B)
2A-2B1	1	58.3	59.4 HRB
	2	58.1	
	3	58.6	
	4	59.2	
	5	60.5	
	6	59.5	
	7	60.1	
	8	60.5	
	9	59.2	
	10	59.5	

Rockwell hardness measurements were made using a 100 kg load on a Leco RT-370 hardness tester.

5.0 Sectioning and Metallography

Figure 5 shows the sections cut from cylinder fragments 2A-2 and 2A-4. A section of the fracture surface was cut from cylinder fragment 2A-2 that removed the flat-faced portion on one side of the inlet hole. A wafer approximately 0.05 inch thick was generated ("FS" in Figure 5) in this process. The remaining piece was then sectioned in a parallel slice, as close as possible to the previous cut. This section was then polished and etched to reveal



its structure ("MET" in Figure 5). This polished metallurgical section should have a microstructure virtually identical to that at the fracture surface itself.

Figure 6(a) shows the wafer containing the fracture surface from Figure 5 and Figure 6(b) shows the etched macrostructure of the same region from the second wafer sliced parallel to the fracture surface. Some correspondence between features on the fracture surface and the grains is seen. Note that the grain size is relatively small, compared to the thickness at the neck.

Figure 7 shows the sectioning performed on fragment 2A-1 from the neck region. The cracks, SC1 and SC2 (Figure 3), were selected for further study. Crack SC1 was forced open in the laboratory, after the remaining ligament was saw-cut part way through. The newly-formed fracture surfaces are shown in Figure 7. Crack SC2 was sectioned just below the inlet hole threads (section 2A-1A2B) and metallurgically polished to reveal its morphology.

Figure 8 shows section 2A-1A2b containing crack SC2. Note the multiple folds at the inside surface and multiple branched cracks emanating from these folds. Figure 8(a) shows the section in the unetched condition and Figure 8(b) shows the microstructure after preparation with a $\text{HF}+\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4+\text{H}_2\text{O}$ etch. The microstructure is typical for AA6351 in the T6 temper condition. Figure 9 shows a higher magnification view of the crack marked "A" in Figure 8. Note that the main crack degenerates into multiple fine-scale branches.

Figure 10 shows the tip of a crack from the subject cylinder that was examined metallographically. Note that the crack appears to be discontinuous. Formation of the crack also appears to be associated with Mg_2Si and AlFeSi compounds in the microstructure, shown as the distributed darker grey phases in Figure 10. To determine if the cracks were associated with a particular type of inclusion, a polished metallographic section was examined in the scanning electron microscope (SEM) and the chemical composition of the inclusions probed by energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS). Figure 11 shows the results of this analysis. Note that the majority of inclusions seen in this micrograph (such as A and C) contain Fe and Mn, and thus are expected to be of the AlFeSi type, a variant of which also contains Mn substitutionally for Fe [2]. Inclusion B, with strong Mg and Si peaks, appears to be Mg_2Si . While not conclusive, Figure 10 and 11 suggest that the cracks form along stringers of AlFeSi compounds.

6.0 Fractography

The wafer containing the flat-faced fracture surface shown in Figure 6 was examined optically and in the scanning electron microscope (SEM). The optical examination revealed that the flat-faced (i.e., planar and radial with respect to the cylinder axis) region of the fracture surface shows little macroscopic ductility. Just outside of this region, the fracture surface transitioned to an inclined (i.e., non-radial with respect to the cylinder



axis) shear-type of fracture. The region just below the inlet hole threads and close to the inside of the cylinder contained some of the chromate coating³ used to line the cylinder, suggesting that a deep fold was present at this location at the time of manufacture. This finding is consistent with the metallographic sectioning.

Fractography of the wafer also shows an apparent beach mark (see Figure 6) in the flat-faced region. SEM fractographs taken from inside and beyond this beach mark, however, fail to provide a clear distinction in the failure mode between these two regions. Figure 12 shows a series of SEM fractographs taken from this fracture surface. Region 1 (Figure 12a) was from near the inside of the tank, close to the threads at the inlet hole. Higher magnification view of region 1 are shown in Figure 12(b) and (c). This region contains a mixture of intergranular and transgranular fracture, with very fine-scale dimples on the faceted surfaces. In region 2 (Figure 12a), in the flat-faced region, the fracture surface contains larger-scaled dimples but still contains intergranular facets with very fine-scale dimples. SEM fractographs of this region are shown in Figure 12 (d) and (e). Region 3 (Figure 12a) is in the shear-lipped region outside of the flat-faced portion of the fracture. This region shows predominantly dimpled rupture, Figure 12(f) and (g). Figure 13 shows energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) surface chemistry results captured from region 1 (near to the inlet hole threads) and region 2 (on the flat-faced fracture away from the inlet hole). The presence of oxygen in region 1, as compared to region 2, suggests that region 1 formed earlier. This is consistent with the flat oxidized appearance of the fracture surface in region 1. These spectra also show chromium (Cr), silver (Ag), calcium (Ca), and chloride (Cl) contamination. The Cr and Ag are likely from the exterior paint and/or the chromate interior coating, perhaps deposited during solvent cleaning of the remains.

Figure 14 shows fractographs of the crack SC2 (see Figures 3 and 7) that was forced open in the laboratory. Figure 14(a) and (b) show matching halves of the fracture surface. Three distinct regions are apparent: region 1, a flat-faced region near to the cylinder's inside surface at the inlet hole; region 3, a similar flat-faced region near to the cylinder's outside surface at the inlet hole; and region 2, a curved fracture surface joining regions 1 and 3. Figure 14 (c)-(j) are a series of SEM fractographs from regions 1 - 3 described above, and from region 4, (see Fig. 12a), close to the extremity of the crack prior to it being forced open. Figure 15 shows EDS spectra captured from the fracture surface (as shown in Figure 12) from regions 1 - 4. Note Ag and Ca contaminants in region 2, similar to those found on the original fracture surface (see Figures 12 and 13).

Figure 16 shows SEM fractographs of the fracture surface from one of the tensile specimens (specimen 2A-1C1, Figure 4) used for mechanical property determination. Note that the fracture surface is primarily ductile dimpled rupture, with both macro and micro dimples, and some intergranular faceting, with microdimpling on these facets. This morphology is consistent with fractographic studies of similar Al alloys in tensile and toughness testing [3]. A comparison of the Figure 16 fractographs with Figures 12

³ the coating on the inside of the cylinder was determined to be of a chromate type, based on an energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) analysis of it (spectra not shown).



and 14, indicates that there is no clear differentiation fractographically between tensile overload and a large portion of the flat-faced fracture surfaces, described above.

7.0 Discussion

Examination and testing of the cylinder remains demonstrates that the subject cylinder meets the chemical and mechanical property requirements of DOT E6498 and current DOT 49 CFR 178.46. Both lead (Pb) and bismuth (Bi) are below the regulation limits specified in both E6498 and 49 CFR 178.46-5. The composition of the alloy indicates that it complies with the Aluminum Association specification for AA6351-T6 in accordance with E6498. The microstructure appears to be typical for this alloy and heat treatment.

Examination of the fracture surfaces of each cylinder fragment suggests that the failure originated from the neck region of the cylinder near to the inlet hole. The flat-faced (i.e., radial) nature of the fracture surface at the neck region with little macroscopic ductility followed by a transition to an inclined (i.e., non-radial) shear-type of fracture on both sides of the cylinder, suggests fast fracture, originating from the flat-faced region on both sides of the inlet hole prior to final rupture. It is clear from Figures 2 and 3 that a sub-critical crack of some size existed on each side of the inlet hole. Both of these sub-critical cracks grew and were incorporated into the fracture surface. It is not clear if one or both of these cracks had reached critical size at the time of rupture.

The location of a beach mark on the fracture surface segment studied in detail (Figures 6 and 12) suggests that this crack propagated sub-critically (i.e., slowly) for the majority of the flat-faced region up to the extent defined by the beach mark. A similar, but perhaps less defined beach mark is present on the opposite side of the inlet hole. These beach marks are consistent with the morphology of cracked regions at the neck of other DOT-6498, DOT-3Al, and DOT-7235 aluminum cylinders that were rejected during hydrostatic retesting [4] and with an Australian-specification aluminum cylinder that leaked during filling [5]. This morphology is also consistent with the fracture surface of a DOT-3AL cylinder that ruptured during filling, provided for FaAA's examination by J. H. Smith of the National Institute of Science and Technology [6].

Sectioning of the cylinder wall just below the threads at the inlet hole revealed multiple cracks from multiple origins at folds (or cusps) in the inside wall. These branched cracks are consistent with cracks found in the neck region of other DOT-6498, DOT-3Al, and DOT-7235 aluminum cylinders [4]. The possible association of cracks with AlFeSi compounds in the microstructure of the subject cylinder is consistent with other reported work on intergranular creep embrittlement of Al-Mg-Si alloys [3]. In this regard the observed cracks are consistent with studies of "sustained-load cracking" at ambient temperature reported in the literature for similar Al alloys [3, 7-9, 10-11].



8.0 Summary and Conclusions

A metallurgical examination of an aluminum cylinder DOT-E6498-2216 type, with serial number T127279 showed the following results.

- This 1977-vintage cylinder meets the chemical specifications of the E6498 exemption and the current 49 CFR 178.46-5 for AA6351 alloy, including lead (Pb) and bismuth (Bi) levels.
- This 1977-vintage cylinder meets the mechanical property specifications of the E6498 exemption and of the current 49 CFR 178.46-5 and 178.46-13.
- Multiple cracks were found originating at folds in the interior wall in the neck region near the inlet hole. These folds were associated with the cylinder's manufacture.
- Cracks showed a multiple-branched morphology; crack tips appeared to be discontinuous.
- The cylinder failed from the neck region when a sub-critical crack in the neck region grew to critical size. The primary fracture surfaces developed from cracks at folds on the interior wall.
- Fracture surfaces were not associated with the neck threads.
- The apparent origin of the fracture is consistent with sustained-load cracks reported in the literature for similar Al alloys. The crack size at the time of rupture appears to be defined by the macroscopic beach marks on the flat-faced (i.e., radial) portions of the fracture surface.



9.0 References

1. J. E. Hatch, Ed., (1984). Aluminum: Properties and Physical Metallurgy, American Society for Metals, Metals Park, OH, p. 363.
2. ASM Metals Handbook, 9th. Ed., Vol. 9, "Metallography and Microstructures", American Society for Metals, Metals Park, OH, p. 356.
3. M. Guttman, B. Quantin, and Ph. Dumoulin (1983). "Intergranular creep embrittlement by non-soluble impurity: Pb precipitation hardened Al-Mg-Si alloys", *Metal Sci.*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 123-140.
4. J. H. Smith (1987). "Evaluation of Cracking in Aluminum Cylinders", NBSIR 86-3492, Institute for Materials Science and Engineering, National Bureau of Standards (NBS), U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Gaithersburg, MD.
5. J. W. H. Price, R. N. Ibrahim and D. Ischenko (1996). "Cracking in Aluminum 6061 and 6351 Gas Cylinders", *Proc. Int. Conf. on Pressure Vessel Technology*, Vol 1., American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), Montreal, Canada, pp. 337-343.
6. per. com., J. H. Smith (1996), Materials Science and Engineering Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Gaithersburg, MD.
7. J. J. Lewandowski, Y. S. Kim, and N. J. H. Holroyd (1992). "Lead-Induced Solid Metal Embrittlement of an Excess Silicon Al-Mg-Si Alloy at Temperatures of -4°C to 80°C", *Met. Trans. A.*, Vol. 23A, pp. 1679-1689.
8. Y. S. Kim, N. J. H. Holroyd, and J. J. Lewandowski (1989). "Pb-Induced Solid-Metal Embrittlement of Al-Mg-Si Alloy at Ambient Temperatures", *Proc. Environment-Induced Cracking of Metals.*, National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE), pp. 371-377.
9. J. J. Lewandowski, V. Kohler, and N. J. H. Holroyd (1987). "Effects of Lead on the Sustained-load Cracking of Al-Mg-Si Alloys at Ambient Temperatures", *Mat. Sci & Eng.*, Vol. 96, pp. 185-195.
10. H. L. Stark and R. N. Ibrahim (1992). "Crack Propagation in Aluminum Gas Cylinder Neck Material at Constant Load and Room Temperature", *Eng. Fracture Mechanics*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 569-575.
11. H. L. Stark and R. N. Ibrahim (1988). "Crack Propagation at Constant Load and Room Temperature in an Extruded Aluminum", *Eng. Fracture Mechanics*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 409-414.






Figure 1. Remains of the cylinder, as received.
Photo ID: DC17916-R4E6.






Figure 2. Mating fracture surfaces (fragments 2A-1 and 2A-2) at the inlet hole. Note the fracture is planar in the neck region.
Photo ID: DC17916-R5E5.






Figure 3. Fragment 2A-1 fracture surface, neck region.
 (a) View perpendicular to fracture surface.
 Photo ID: DC17916-R4E20.
 (b) View inclined to fracture surface.
 Photo ID: DC17916-R4E21.
 Note: FS marks the fracture surface, SC1 and SC2
 are secondary cracks.






Figure 4. Cylinder fragment 2A-1.
 (a) Sections cut. Mech denotes the piece used for machining tensile test coupons.
 Photo ID: DC17916-R12E1.
 (b) Tensile test coupons in the post-tested condition.
 Photo ID: DC17916-R11E21.



Figure 5. Sectioning of fragments 2A-2 and 2A-4.
Photo ID: DC17916-R4E6.

Note: FS denotes the wafer containing a portion of the flat-faced fracture surface, MET denotes the wafer cut below the FS wafer and used for metallographic examination, and HT denotes the section used for Rockwell hardness measurements.






Figure 6. Wafers FS and MET from Figure 5.

(a) Portion of flat-faced fracture surface from neck region of fragment 2A-1. Photo ID: DC17916-TRS-1-01/14/97.

(b) Macrostructure of neck region of fragment 2A-1. HF/H₂SO₄/H₂O etch. Photo ID:DC17916-PAL-1-10/31/96. Scale is in 0.02 inch increments.

Note: Inside cylinder coating on the fracture surface as shown. Unlabeled arrows define an apparent beach mark on the fracture surface.






Figure 7. Sectioning of fragment 2A-1 in the neck region.
Photo ID: DC17916-R11E2.
Note: The crack SC1 (see Figure 3) forced open in the laboratory and the crack SC2 contained within the sections 2A-1A2A and 2A-1A2B.





Figure 8.
Metallographic sections of 2A-1A2B containing SC2. 50X.
(a) Unetched. Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-12.3-11/08/96.
(b) HF/H₂SO₄/H₂O etch. Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-4.5.6-11/08/96.



Figure 9. Close-up of crack "A" from Figure 8. 400X.
Unetched. Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-9,10-11/08/96.






Figure 10. A crack tip from Figure 8.


(a) Tip region. 50X. Unetched.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-7-11/08/96


(b) Detail of tip. 500X.. Unetched.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-8-11/08/96







a



b



c



d

Figure 11. Precipitates near a crack tip.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-12-01/31/97

- (a) SEM micrograph of a crack tip.
- (b) EDS spectrum of inclusion A.
- (c) EDS spectrum of inclusion B.
- (d) EDS spectrum of inclusion C.




Figure 12. Fractography of fracture surface (planar-region) from fragment 2A-2.

(a) Optical fractograph depicting the neck region.
Note the locations 1, 2, and 3.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-4-10/10/96.

(b) SEM fractograph from region 1. 250X.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-1-01/15/97.

(c) SEM fractograph from region 1. 1000X.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-4-01/15/97.


(d) SEM fractograph from region 2. 250X.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-2-01/15/97.

(e) SEM fractograph from region 2. 1000X.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-5-01/15/97.


(f) SEM fractograph from region 3. 250X.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-3-01/15/97.

(g) SEM fractograph from region 3. 1000X.
Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-6-01/15/97.

Note: Arrows in (a) define apparent beach mark.



(a)



(b)

Figure 13. EDS Spectra captured from the flat-faced fracture surface.
 (a) Region 1.
 (b) Region 2.






Figure 14.

Fractography of fracture surfaces of crack SC2 forced open in the laboratory.

(a) Fracture surface. Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-17A-12/10/96.

Scale is in 0.05 inch increments. Note regions 1, 2, 3, and 4.

(b) Mating fracture surface to (a). Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-18A-12/10/96.

Scale is in 0.05 inch increments.

(c) SEM fractograph from region 1. 250X.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-9-01/15/97.

(d) SEM fractograph from region 1. 1000X.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-10-12/10/96.

(e) SEM fractograph from region 2. 250X.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-11-12/10/96.

(f) SEM fractograph from region 2. 1000X.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-12-12/10/96.

(g) SEM fractograph from region 3. 250X.

Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-13-12/10/96.

(h) SEM fractograph from region 3. 1000X.


Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-14-12/10/96.

(i) SEM fractograph from region 4. 250X.


Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-15-12/10/96.

(j) SEM fractograph from region 4. 1000X.


Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-16-12/10/96.




(a) Region 1



(b) Region 2



(c) Region 3



(d) Region 4

Figure 15. EDS Spectra from fracture surface shown in Figure 12.




Figure 16.

SEM fractographs of a tensile specimen.

(a) 250X. Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-7-12/10/96.

(b) 1000X. Photo ID: DC17916-PAL-8-12/10/96



Appendix A: Recommended Scope of Work



Recommended Scope of Work for Metallurgical Evaluation of Aluminum Cylinder

1. **Photodocumentation.** Prior to any destructive examination of this cylinder, it will be photodocumented to illustrate its "as-received condition". After each cutting operation needed to remove samples for testing or evaluation (such as required for chemical samples) the cylinder and sample will be photodocumented to illustrate the sample location. Photodocument the primary fracture surface as well as any secondary cracks that may be present. Any corrosion deposits or other visible surface contaminants should also be photodocumented
2. **Corrosion.** Testing for corrosion product should be done prior to any extensive cutting or handling of the cylinder remains. Swipe samples or cutting of material containing any such potential corrosion products should be taken. When cutting is performed, care should be used to minimize contamination of the cylinder surfaces. Swipe samples or samples containing potential corrosion products should first be analyzed by scanning electron microscopy and energy dispersive spectroscopy (SEM/EDS).
3. **Chemical Analysis.** The cylinder aluminum alloy will be analyzed for chemical composition to compare with materials specifications. Material from the neck region, side wall and cylinder bottom will be analyzed to check for alloy homogeneity. The analysis will also determine the concentration of potentially detrimental trace elements, such as lead.
4. **Macroetching.** A thin slice of material will be removed from the neck of the cylinder that includes a least one inch of side wall material. This slice will be macroetched to show the grain macro/microstructure in this area.
5. **Fractography.** SEM and stereo-microscopic examination should be performed on all fractures. Particular attention should be focused in the regions where the fracture originated. Any indications of fatigue, stress-corrosion cracking, ductile rupture, inter/intra-granular fracture features, etc., should be photodocumented.
6. **Dimensional Checking.** Prior to extensive cutting, the cylinder wall thickness at various locations and other cylinder features, such as threads, cylinder internal diameter, inlet hole diameter should be measured and compared to the original cylinder drawings. Measurements done should be sufficient to determine the minimum wall thickness as well as to document any extensive plastic tearing that may have resulted in the failure event.
7. **Secondary Cracking.** A section of the primary fracture surface near the crack origin should be metallographically polished. Any secondary cracking near the failure origin should be evaluated. These sections should be first examined in the unetched condition and photodocumented to look for crack branching. The sample should then be etched, re-examined and photodocumented.
8. **Material Hardness.** The material hardness shall be evaluated in the neck, wall and cylinder bottom by means of macrohardness testing according to ASTM standards.
9. **Physical Testing.**
 - mechanical test per 49 CFR, 178.46-13
 - flattening test per 49 CFR, 178.46-12
10. **Report.** Report should contain a description of all tests performed and the results obtained. If possible, state the location of the crack origin, mode of fracture, and likely cause of failure.



Appendix B: Detailed Photodocumentation of Cylinder






Photo ID: DC17916-R4E7




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E8






Photo ID: DC17916-R4E10




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E11






Photo ID: DC17916-R4E12




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E13






Photo ID: DC17916-R4E14




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E16





Photo ID: DC17916-R4E17




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E18





Photo ID: DC17916-R4E19




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E20




Photo ID: DC17916-R4E21



Photo ID: DC17916-R4E22





Photo ID: DC17916-R4E23



Photo ID: DC17916-R4E24






Photo ID: DC17916-R4E25




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E3





Photo ID: DC17916-R5E4




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E5





Photo ID: DC17916-R5E6




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E7





Photo ID: DC17916-R5E8



Photo ID: DC17916-R5E10






Photo ID: DC17916-R5E11




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E12







Photo ID: DC17916-R5E13



Photo ID: DC17916-R5E14






Photo ID: DC17916-R5E15



Photo ID: DC17916-R5E16






Photo ID: DC17916-R5E17




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E18






Photo ID: DC17916-R5E19



Photo ID: DC17916-R5E20






Photo ID: DC17916-R5E21




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E22





Photo ID: DC17916-R5E23




Photo ID: DC17916-R5E24





Photo ID: DC17916-R5E25

